





CM

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/832,214	04/11/2001	Earl J. Votolato	SPELL-003B	9944
34284	7590 05/05/2003			
ROBERT D. FISH; RUTAN & TUCKER, LLP			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1950 611 ANTON BLVD., 14TH FLOOR			DRUAN, THOMAS J	
COSTA ME	COSTA MESA, CA 92628-1950		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	G
			DATE MAILED: 05/05/2003	ĭ

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/832,214	VOTOLATO, EARL J.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Thomas J. Druan, Jr.	3724			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet v	vith the correspondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu - Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insigns of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a within the statutory minimum of the vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MC, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed irty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 F	ebruary 2003 .				
2a)⊠	This action is FINAL . 2b) Th	is action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowated closed in accordance with the practice under	•	•			
• <u> </u>	ion of Claims					
•	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
·) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
<u> </u>	Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are rejected.					
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	u alandian vanuiramant				
,	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o ion Papers	r election requirement.				
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	۶۲.				
,—	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accept	<u></u>	the Examiner.			
, —	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abe	yance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)[The proposed drawing correction filed on	_ is: a)□ approved b)□	disapproved by the Examiner.			
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in re	ply to this Office action.				
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.				
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120					
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.				
	2. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received in	Application No			
* ;	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	•			
14) 🔲 .	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest	ic priority under 35 U.S.C	c. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).			
	a) The translation of the foreign language pro Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domest					
Attachme	nt(s)					
2) Noti	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _	5) Notice of	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 09/832,214

Art Unit: 3724

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Applicant's amendment received on 10 February 2003.

2. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1-3 & 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 4,980,977 to Matin et al. (hereinafter Matin).

Matin discloses the invention as claimed including a handle 2; a blade 7; a transparent (column 4, lines 40-41) blade cover/cap structure 8 with spring 10; and a blade-cover locking system comprising a cover lock member with a first engagement element, notch 21 (in Fig. 2A) in a wall of the blade cover, and hand-operable cover-release member 16/17/22 with a second engagement member, a distal end of outwardly biased arm structure 22, whereby engagement of said elements with each other maintains the blade cover in a locked mode (column 2, lines 2-6). Said cap member has a floor formed by flanges 23, with a slot between said flanges from where the blade 7 is exposed during a cutting operation (Fig. 5A). Arm 22 and handle 2 are fabricated from the same piece of material (column 2, lines 23-30).

4. Claims 1 & 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by US 6,308,418 to Sweet (hereinafter Sweet).

Application/Control Number: 09/832,214

Art Unit: 3724

Sweet discloses the invention as claimed including a handle 14 with an arm structure 22, wherein the handle and arm are fabricated from the same piece of material; a blade 100; an integral, movable blade cover 16 with a blade cover biasing member, spring 50, for urging the blade cover to a position covering the blade (column 6, lines 23-28); and a blade-cover locking system comprising a cover lock member 12 with a first engagement element, aperture 54, that cooperates with a second engagement member, a distal end 28 of arm structure 22, whereby engagement of said elements with each other maintains the blade cover in a locked mode, and disengagement with each other releases the blade cover from said locked position.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 4 & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Matin.

Matin discloses the invention as claimed, including a cap structure that is arcuately movable and a cap structure that is arcuately shaped at a rear end thereof (see Fig. 2A).

Alternatively, if it was intended that the entire cap structure be arcuately shaped, then Matin discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a cap structure that is arcuately movable, but lacks a cap structure that is arcuately shaped. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to make the cap structure of Matin arcuately shaped so as to better conform to the shape of a blade which is arcuately shaped (column 3, lines 14-19) since it has been held that a change in form or shape is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 3724

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 10 February 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant contends that the arm and handle of Matin are not fabricated from the same piece of material because the arm is "manually inserted into the handgrip portion of the knife."

Applicant's remarks are well taken; however, it is the Examiner's position that the reference anticipates the claimed rejection. Matin discloses a knife with a guard that is locked in a position covering a blade until a release assembly is manually triggered, allowing the guard to pivot up and allow the blade to be used. The specification of Matin discloses that the knife can me made entirely out of metal or made of plastic via compression molding (column 4, lines 50-56), where a single plastic charge is set in a mold and force is applied to spread the plastic into a mold. Oftentimes a single mold produces several pieces, that can be separated and used together in a single device. Therefore, both the arm 22 and handle 2 of Matin can be fabricated from the same piece of material. The examiner notes that the language "fabricated from the same piece of material" does not require that the pieces be formed as a single, unitary, or continuous piece. Therefore, the grounds of rejection is deemed proper.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thomas J. Druan, Jr. whose telephone number is 703-308-4200. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-6:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Allan N. Shoap can be reached on 703-308-1082. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

BOYER ASHLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

tjd April 24, 2003